

auditing program. The facility should have an acceptable compliance history including no open or recent major enforcement actions.

Upon acceptance to the program, the participant will sign a Letter of Commitment with the EPA Region, participating state regulatory agencies, and participating local regulatory agencies. Facilities renewing their status as a StarTrack company after their first year will not need to re-apply to the program, but will need to sign a Letter of Commitment for the new year of participation. The participant will be required to submit several reports documenting required StarTrack activities throughout the 12-month period of participation. It is ultimately the responsibility of the StarTrack facility to ensure that the following required documents are submitted to EPA in a timely fashion: audit workplans, reports and corrective action plans for all compliance and EMS audits; third party certifier reports and certifications; the facility improvement plan (in response to the certification report); and an annual environmental performance report.

Application to StarTrack is voluntary. Information submitted as part of the requirements for ongoing participation in the program (e.g., EMS and compliance audits, status reports, etc.) is mandatory to maintain StarTrack participatory status and to obtain the Program benefits.

EPA shall treat information claimed as confidential business information (CBI) in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR part 2. If the participant fails to claim the information as confidential upon submission, it may be made available to the public without further notice. EPA cannot guarantee that information submitted pursuant to this agreement and claimed as confidential will be immune from disclosure to a requester under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Participating state agencies will maintain CBI confidentiality to the extent allowed by relevant state law. Note that some state laws provide for a greater degree of access to and narrower protections for information considered confidential under federal law.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary

for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: It is estimated that approximately 50 facilities may voluntarily apply to StarTrack annually in Region 1, and as many as 250 if the program were to be expanded to other EPA Regions. EPA estimates that 35 facilities may satisfy the requirements for participation in the StarTrack Program. An estimated 36 hours per facility will be expended to provide EPA with data for application to StarTrack. This burden hour estimate translates to a cost of approximately \$1,127.88 per facility [\$31.33/hour times 36 hours] and a total cost to industry of approximately \$56,394 [\$1,127.88 per facility times 50 facilities].

During those years of participation when third-party certification is not required, facilities will expend a total of 156 hours preparing all documents and conducting all activities required under the program. This represents a cost of \$4,887.48 per facility [\$31.33/hour times 156 hours] and a total cost to industry of \$171,061.80 [\$4,887.48 per facility times 35 facilities]. Total capital and start-up costs may vary based on the degree to which participants already conduct the required activities at their facilities.

In those years requiring third party certification, facilities will expend an additional 67 hours for conducting all the associated activities. This represents an additional cost to industry of \$7,481.89 per facility [67 hours times \$111.67/hour] and a total cost to industry of \$261,866.15 [35 facilities times \$7,481.89]. (For 1998, program participants will commit for one year. Continued participation will be considered once all first year project tasks are completed and have been evaluated. Triennial third-party certification will be implemented, if appropriate, in the adoption of any agreement for continuing participation.)

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: August 19, 1998.

Thomas D'Avanzo,

Acting Chief, Assistance and Pollution Prevention Office.

[FR Doc. 98-24775 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5495-4]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared August 10, 1998 Through August 14, 1998 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES AT (202) 564-7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 10, 1998 (62 FR 17856).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-L65293-00 Rating EC2, Upper Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Based Lands Management Plan, Implementation, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, ID, MT, WY, NV and UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with these issues: (1) the lack of adequate provisions to identify and protect high quality waters and aquatic habitats, (2) the uncertainty with how impaired waters will be addressed, (3) the uncertainty with the nature of restoration and conservation efforts and their associated impacts, (4) the lack of

a clear protocol for determining how conflicts between competing objectives and needs will be resolved, (5) the implications of less than full budget for implementation. EPA suggests combining some of the features of Alternatives 7 and 6 with Alternative 4. EPA strongly supports ecosystem management principles on a broad scale to analyze resources issues that transcend jurisdictional boundaries.

ERP No. D-COE-E32078-00 Rating EO3, Savannah Harbor Section 203 Expansion Project, Channel Deepening, Harbor Improvements, Georgia Ports Authority, Federal Navigation Project, Chatham County, Ga and Jasper County, SC.

Summary: EPA concluded that the document does not contain adequate modeling and sediment chemistry information necessary to make a decision as to the biotic and water quality impacts. EPA also had environmental objections about the extent/duration of adverse impacts resulting from the magnitude of channel deepening and whether necessary mitigation for functional losses is practicable.

ERP No. D-FHW-D40143-MD Rating EC2, MD-331—Dover Bridge, Construction, Right-of-Way Grant, US Coast Guard Bridge Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Easton, Talbot and Caroline County, MD.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding impacts to aquatic resources, including associated tidal marsh wetlands. EPA requested additional information on storm water run-off, bridge shading effects and wetland mitigation.

ERP No. D-FHW-L40207-WA Rating EC2, Interstate 90 (I-90) South Sammamish Plateau Access Road and Sunset Interchange Modifications, Construction, COE Section 404 Permit, Coastal Zone Management and NPDES Permits, King County, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns based on potential adverse environmental effects to waters of the United States from the project and undisclosed potential cumulative affects from planned activities in lands adjacent to the project site. More information is needed to clarify design specifications to ensure that proper stormwater management practices will be implemented to appropriately protect receiving-water quality.

ERP No. D-NOA-B91026-ME Rating EC1, Atlantic Herring (*Clupea harengus harengus*) Fishery Management Plan (FWP), Management Measures, Exclusive Ecosystem Zone (EEZ), Gulf of Maine, George Bank, ME.

Summary: EPA supports the actions proposed by NMFES; additional information was requested for enforcement of fishery management plan, and adulteration of scallop meat.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-COE-E32077-GA Brunswick Harbor Deepening Federal Navigation Project, Improvements, Brunswick, Glynn County, GA.

Summary: EPA continues to be concerned about the project's adverse impacts and mitigations, while a number of modifications/clarifications were made to the channel upgrade. Future interagency coordination will be necessary.

Other

ERP No. LD-COE-L36111-WA Rating EC2, Howard A. Hanson Dam (HHD) Additional Water Storage (AWS) Phase I Project, Construction and Operation, Green River Basin, Pierce and King Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns on potential cumulative impacts of activities in adjacent lands, potential indirect effects on fish habitat and water quality, and discussion of a possibly restricted range of alternatives. EPA also identified the need for a clear statement of public disclosure of Phase I monitoring results before initiating Phase II of the project.

Dated: September 8, 1998.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 98-24493 Filed 9-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-5495-3]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-7167 OR (202) 564-7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements

Filed August 31, 1998 Through

September 4, 1998

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 980341, Final EIS, FHW, FL, East-West Multimodal Corridor Transportation Improvements, Beginning at the Tamiami Campus of Florida International University (FIU) extending the length of FL 836, Port of Miami, Dade County, FL Due: August 28, 1998, Contact: Robert M. Callan (904) 681-7223.

The above EIS should have appeared in the 8-28-98 Notice of Availability in the FR. The 30 Day-Wait period is calculated from 8-28-98.

EIS No. 980342, Final EIS, FTA, FL, Adoption—East-West Multimodal Corridor Transportation Improvements, Begins Tamiami Campus of Florida International University (FIU) extends the length of FL 836, Port of Miami Dade County, FL, Due: September 28, 1998, Contact: Elizabeth Martin (404) 562-3509.

The US Department of Transportation (DOT), Federal Transit Administration is Adopting DOT, Federal Highway Administration's Final EIS filed with EPA on 9-21-98. The above Notice of Availability should have appeared in the 8-28-98 **Federal Register**. The 30-Day Wait Period is calculated from 8-28-98.

EIS No. 980343, Draft EIS, NPS, CA, Mojave National Preserve General Management Plan, Implementation, San Bernardino County, CA, Due: December 09, 1998, Contact: Alan Schmierer (415) 427-1441.

EIS No. 980344, Draft Supplement, NOAA, Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan, Updated Information concerning Overfishing of Red Hake and Silver Hake Fisheries, Northeast United States, Due: October 26, 1998, Contact: Kathi Rodrigues (202) 482-5158.

EIS No. 980345, Final EIS, NPS, WA, Lake Crescent Management Plan, Implementation, Olympic National Park, WA, Due: October 13, 1998, Contact: David Morris (360) 452-4501.

EIS No. 980346, Draft EIS, NPS, CA, NV, CA, NV, Death Valley National Park General Management Plan, Implementation, Mojave Desert, Inyo and San Bernardino Counties, CA and Nye and Esmeralda Counties, NV, Due: December 10, 1998, Contact: Alan Schmierer (415) 427-1441.

EIS No. 980347, Draft EIS, AFS, ID, Goose Creek Watershed Project, Harvesting Timber and Improve Watershed, Payette National Forest, New Meadows Ranger District, Adams County, ID, Due: October 27, 1998, Contact: Kimberly Brandel (208) 347-0300.

EIS No. 980348, Final EIS, FTA, NJ, Newark-Elizabeth Rail Link (NERL) Study Corridor, Transportation Improvements, Light Rail Transit (LRT), Essex and Union Counties, NJ, Due: October 13, 1998, Contact: Steven F. Faust (212) 264-8162.

EIS No. 980349, Draft Supplement, UMC, CA, Sewage Effluent Compliance Project, Updated and